IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CONSTANTINE N. POLITES, Plaintiff,	CIVIL ACTION
v.	NO. 19-4345
CITY OF PHILADELPHIA, Defendant.	: :
ORDER	
AND NOW, this day of	, 2019, upon consideration of
Plaintiff's Motion to Remand in the form of a Letter Response to Defendant's Notice of	
Removal, and Defendant's response thereto, it is hereby ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion to	
Remand in the form of a Letter Response to Defendant's Notice of Removal is GRANTED.	
IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint is remanded	
to the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas for further proceedings.	
SO ORDERED:	
Joyner, J.	

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CONSTANTINE N. POLITES, : CIVIL ACTION

Plaintiff,

:

v. : NO. 19-4345

:

CITY OF PHILADELPHIA,

Defendant. :

DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO REMAND IN THE FORM OF A LETTER RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S NOTICE OF REMOVAL

Defendant, City of Philadelphia (the "City"), by and through the undersigned counsel, hereby files this Response to Plaintiff's Motion to Remand in the form of a Letter Response to Defendant's Notice of Removal ("Letter Response"). [Dkt. 2].

On September 13, 2019, Plaintiff, Constantine N. Polites ("Plaintiff"), filed a second amended complaint ("Second Amended Complaint") pro se against Defendant, City of Philadelphia (hereinafter "Defendant" or "City") in the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas. See Second Amended Complaint (hereinafter cited as "Second Am. Cmplt."), at Dkt. 1. On September 20, 2019, the City removed the Seconded Amended Complaint to federal court on the basis that Plaintiff asserts an equal protection claim. *Id*.

On October 1, 2019, Plaintiff filed his Letter Response to the City's removal. In his Letter Response, Plaintiff appears to argue that he employed the expression "discrimination against commercial properties" as employed by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania in *Valley Forge Towers Apartments N, LP v. Upper Merion Area Sch. Dist.*, 163 A.3d 962 (Pa. 2017). Letter Reponses at ¶3. Plaintiff further clearly states that the City's characterization of Plaintiff's

Second Amended Complaint as being a Federal Civil Rights discrimination matter "is without

merit." *Id.* at ¶1.

The City acknowledges that pro se pleadings are to be liberally construed. See Haines v.

Kerner, 404 U.S. 519 (1972). Therefore, without assessing the merit of Plaintiff's allegations in

the context of supporting a state law claim, the City adopts Plaintiff's assertion that he has not

raised a Federal Civil Rights claim and does not oppose Plaintiff's request to remand Plaintiff's

Second Amended Complaint to the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas for further proceedings.

Date: October 7, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Meghan E. Claiborne_

Meghan E. Claiborne, Esquire **Deputy City Solicitor** Pa. Attorney ID No. 315918 City of Philadelphia Law Department 1515 Arch Street, 14th Floor Philadelphia, PA 19102

(215) 683-5447

meghan.claiborne@phila.gov

3

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CONSTANTINE N. POLITES, : CIVIL ACTION

Plaintiff,

v. : NO. 19-4345

•

CITY OF PHILADELPHIA,

Defendant.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the date below, the Defendant's Response to Plaintiff's Motion to Remand in the form of a Letter Response to Defendant's Notice of Removal was filed via the Court's electronic filing system and is available for downloading.

I further certify that on the date below, a copy of Defendant's Response to Plaintiff's Motion to Remand in the form of a Letter Response to Defendant's Notice of Removal was also served upon the following via first-class mail:

Constantine N. Polites 801 Yale Ave. #1023 Swathmore, PA 19018 Plaintiff Pro Se

Date: October 7, 2019 Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Meghan E. Claiborne Meghan E. Claiborne